

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

OSCAR SANDOVAL,

Defendant and Appellant.

B158424

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. PA037933)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Meredith Taylor, Judge. Affirmed.

Harry I. Zimmerman, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Oscar Sandoval appeals the judgment entered after conviction following plea of no contest to corporal injury to a cohabitant. (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subd. (a).) Sandoval admitted one prior conviction within the meaning of the Three Strikes law and two prior prison terms within the meaning of Penal Code section 667.5. Pursuant to a plea bargain, the trial court sentenced Sandoval to a term of 10 years in state prison.

We appointed counsel to represent Sandoval on this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief on October 23, 2002, in which no issues were raised and which requested this court to conduct an independent review of the record. The clerk of this court thereafter advised Sandoval to file any contention, issue or ground of appeal he wished this court to consider within 30 days. Sandoval requested appointment of new counsel on appeal and numerous extensions of time within which to file a supplemental letter brief. The last such extension expired on March 26, 2003, without Sandoval having filed a supplemental letter brief. On April 1, 2003, Sandoval filed a fourth request for an extension of time within which to file a supplemental opening brief. On April 2, 2003, this court denied Sandoval's request.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### *1. Ineffective assistance of appointed appellate counsel.*

Sandoval's request for appointment of substitute counsel on appeal is based on Sandoval's belief appointed appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance in failing to raise appropriate issues on appeal. We deferred consideration of this request pending our review of the entire record. Having completed that review, we conclude Sandoval's request for substitute counsel on appeal lacks merit. Sandoval fails to state any specific deficiency in appellate counsel's performance and our independent review of the record does not disclose any basis for granting a request for substitution of counsel. (See *People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118.) Accordingly, we deny Sandoval's request for substitution of counsel on appeal.

*2. Review of the entire record.*

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied Sandoval's counsel has complied fully with counsel's responsibilities. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

KLEIN, P.J.

We concur:

CROSKEY, J.

KITCHING, J.